

Who is to blame?

Article (Unspecified)

Zagefka, Hanna, Binder, Jens, Brown, Rupert and Hancock, Landon (2013) Who is to blame? Social Psychology, 44 (6). pp. 398-407. ISSN 1864-9335

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/52951/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Social Psychology

www.hogrefe.com/journals/sp

Editor-in-Chief

Christian Unkelbach

Associate Editors

Juliane Degner · Roland Deutsch · Gerald Echterhoff

Hans-Peter Erb · Michael Häfner · Markus Kemmelmeier

Alison Ledgerwood · Margaret Shih

HOGREFE



Social Psychology

Your article has appeared in a journal published by Hogrefe Publishing. This e-offprint is provided exclusively for the personal use of the authors. It may not be posted on a personal or institutional website or to an institutional or disciplinary repository.

If you wish to post the article to your personal or institutional website or to archive it in an institutional or disciplinary repository, please use either a pre-print or a post-print of your manuscript in accordance with the publication release for your article and our “Online Rights for Journal Articles”

(www.hogrefe.com/journals).

Who Is to Blame?

The Relationship Between Ingroup Identification and Relative Deprivation Is Moderated by Ingroup Attributions

Hanna Zagefka¹, Jens Binder², Rupert Brown³, and Landon Hancock⁴

¹Royal Holloway, University of London, UK, ²Nottingham Trent University, UK,
³University of Sussex, UK, ⁴Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA

Abstract. Contradictory evidence can be found in the literature about whether ingroup identification and perceived relative deprivation are positively or negatively related. Indeed, theoretical arguments can be made for both effects. It was proposed that the contradictory findings can be explained by considering a hitherto unstudied moderator: the extent to which deprivation is attributed to the ingroup. It was hypothesized that identification would only have a negative impact on deprivation, and that deprivation would only have a negative impact on identification, if ingroup attributions are high. To test this, we experimentally manipulated attributions to the ingroup among British student participants ($N = 189$), who were asked about their perceived deprivation vis-à-vis German students, yielding support for the hypotheses.

Keywords: deprivation, identification, attributions

There is no shortage of groups that rebel against their deprived status. To name but a few examples, Scots routinely complain about their status vis-à-vis the English, Muslim youths riot in Bedford and other British towns to draw attention to their situation, and East Germans often grumble about their situation vis-à-vis West Germans. Yet, there are also many examples of social groups who are objectively deprived but who are not propelled into action to address their situation (Crocker & Major, 1989). This can be observed for various ethnic groups as well as for women in general (Crosby, 1982; Zagefka & Brown, 2005). Moreover, the question of what leads people to rebel has been of great concern to both researchers and politicians (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001; Simon, 2004). An interesting question in this context is the relationship between identification with one's social group and the deprivation felt on behalf of this group. Are those who are more strongly identified with their group likely to feel more or less relative ingroup deprivation on important dimensions – and therefore feel more compelled to act?

A central idea at the heart of two major theories of intergroup relations is that perceived comparative outcomes play a causal role in determining group members' attitudes and behavioral intentions toward other groups. Relative deprivation theory (RDT) proposes that people's feelings of (dis)satisfaction, and hence their intergroup

attitudes, stem primarily from subjective comparisons between ingroup attainments and aspirations (Gurr, 1970; Olson, Herman, & Zanna, 1986; Runciman, 1966; Walker & Smith, 2002). Aspirations are thought to be determined either by comparisons with the attainments of other groups or by reference to the ingroup's past (Brown & Zagefka, 2006). Similarly, social identity theory (SIT) posits that ingroup members' collective self-esteem, and hence their desire to engage in positive intergroup differentiation, are derived mainly from comparisons with relevant outgroups (Brown, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Such a hypothesis rests on some necessary minimal group identification with the ingroup.

Both RDT and SIT place central importance on the concept of perceived comparative outcomes, which are linked to deprivation (in RDT) and identification (SIT). However, an interesting and rather neglected question is the nature of the relationship between people's feelings of relative deprivation and their level of identification. As we show below, the available empirical evidence is rather contradictory, and explanatory theorizing is notable by its absence. In this paper we seek to clarify some of this confusion by suggesting that an important moderator of the deprivation–identification relationship is the extent to which ingroup members make internal (i.e., ingroup) attributions for their deprived condition.

Ingroup Identification

The point of departure for SIT is that, in particular contexts, a given ingroup matters for its members – they identify with it. Presumably, groups matter to their members to different degrees. That is, people's strength of group identification can vary. Many conceptualizations of ingroup identification have been proposed, distinguishing different facets of the concept (e.g., Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004; Ellemers, Kortekaas, & Ouwerkerk, 1999; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Leach et al., 2008; Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, Halevy, & Eidelson, 2008). Yet, despite this diversity of measurement approaches, there is some convergence among them that, as originally suggested by SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), identification should be seen as comprising both cognitive and affective components, and these tend to be strongly related (e.g., Brown, Condor, Matthews, Wade, & Williams, 1986). Hence, for someone with high ingroup identification, group membership is an important aspect of his/her self-concept (cognitive component), and that person will also feel positively about this group membership (affective component).

Perceived Relative Deprivation

A key distinction in RDT is between individual deprivation (based on interindividual comparisons) and group deprivation (based on intergroup comparisons, Runciman, 1966; Schmitt, Maes, & Widaman, 2010; Vanneman & Pettigrew, 1972). For intergroup relations, the latter construct is central. Numerous different definitions of perceived relative deprivation can be found in the literature (Smith, Pettigrew, Pippin, & Bialosiewicz, 2012; Walker & Smith, 2002), for instance, as a discrepancy between expectations and capabilities (Gurr, 1970), as an is-ought discrepancy (Schmitt & Maes, 2002), as including both wanting and deserving as necessary conditions (Olson, Roese, Meen, & Robertson, 1995), or as including the necessary conditions of both negative outcomes and illegitimacy appraisals (Kawakami & Dion, 1995; see Crosby, 1976; and Folger, 1986, for yet other conceptualizations). Many researchers include both a cognitive (i.e., awareness of disadvantage) and affective (anger, dissatisfaction) deprivation component (e.g., Guimond & Dube-Simard, 1983; Petta & Walker, 1992; Tropp & Wright, 1999; Zagefka & Brown, 2005; see also Osborne, Smith, & Huo, 2012).

The Relationship Between Identification and Deprivation: Empirical Evidence

The research evidence on the valence, strength, and direction of the association between identification and deprivation paints a decidedly ambiguous picture (Tougas & Beaton, 2002). Tropp and Wright's (1999) data, provided by

Latino and African-American respondents, yielded evidence for a positive association. Similarly, Mummendey, Kessler, Klink, and Mielke (1999) found a positive association between identification and group deprivation in the form of fraternal resentment for (lower-status) East Germans (vis-à-vis West Germans); Kessler and Mummendey (2002) found identification and resentment of group deprivation to be positively correlated for East Germans; Ellemers and Bos (1987) found a positive link between identification and group deprivation for Dutch shopkeepers (vis-à-vis immigrant shopkeepers); Petta and Walker (1992) found a positive link between perceived deprivation and identification for Italian immigrants in Australia; Duckitt and Mphuthing (2002) found that deprivation positively affected identification; Abrams (1990) found a positive correlation between identification and group deprivation for Scottish participants; and Gurin and Townsend (1986) found a positive correlation between gender identity and collective discontent.

At the same time, Tougas and Veilleux (1988) found no relationship between identification and group deprivation for women; Lalonde and Cameron (1993) also found no link between identification and group disadvantage for immigrants; and Guimond and Dube-Simard (1983) found a zero correlation between identification and (cognitive) perceptions of deprivation for Quebec nationalists (although they did find a link between identification and dissatisfaction).

Evidence for a negative association between identification and deprivation also exists. Abrams (1990) found a negative correlation between identification and self-outgroup deprivation for Scots; Abrams, Hinkle, and Tomlins (1999) found a negative effect of anticipated deprivation on identification for residents of Hong Kong; and Smith, Spears and Hamstra's (1999) artificial laboratory group participants with higher identification also displayed a tendency to perceive less deprivation. In our own work, we also obtained evidence for a negative association between identification and perceived deprivation among an ethnic minority sample in Britain as well as among ethnic minority and majority samples in Germany (Zagefka & Brown, 2005). The variables were also negatively related among two further German majority samples ($Ns = 317; 116$), another German minority sample ($N = 166$), and a further sample of ethnic minority members from Britain ($N = 209$, Zagefka, 2004; see also Bornman & Applegryn, 1999; Trew & Benson, 1996; Veilleux, Tougas, & Rinfret, 1992, for further evidence on the identification–deprivation relationship).

The Relationship Between Identification and Deprivation: Theoretical Accounts

Four opposite predications might be derived from the literature and are discussed in turn: a positive effect of identification on deprivation, a positive effect of deprivation on identification, a negative effect of identification on deprivation,

vation, and a negative effect of deprivation on identification. Indeed, the relationship between identification and deprivation can be expected to have some element of bicausality (Petta & Walker, 1992; Simon & Klandermans, 2001; Tougas & Beaton, 2002). On the basis of social identity theory, which proposes that group members are motivated to obtain positive self-esteem, one might expect a *positive effect of identification on deprivation*. As Tropp and Wright (1999) point out, those who are highly identified are more committed to their ingroup (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1997) and desire more for their ingroup (Wann & Branscombe, 1995). Therefore, they might be expected to guard the ingroup's interests more vigilantly as well as to be more sensitive to information that reflects negatively on the ingroup (Simon & Klandermans, 2001). In this view, high identifiers should have a radar that is more finely attuned to injustices and disadvantages the ingroup might suffer from, perhaps because group identities are more salient to them (Kawakami & Dion, 1993). SIT and stigma researchers also suggest that high identifiers might be more likely to make intergroup (rather than intragroup) comparisons (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998; Doise, 1988; Major, 1994), and that they are therefore in a better position to detect existing group disadvantages. On this basis, one might expect a positive effect of identification on perceived deprivation.

However, SIT also implies the opposite relationship, that is, a *positive effect of deprivation on identification*: Tajfel and Turner (1986) argue that conflicts of group interests lead to heightened identification, and outgroup threats generally can be expected to increase identification (Dion, 1979). Since perceived group deprivation can be expected to be closely related to perceived intergroup conflict, one might infer that deprivation might increase identification.

At the same time, the prediction of a *negative effect of identification on deprivation* might also be derived from SIT. The theory proposes that the more highly someone is identified, the more motivated he/she should be to see their group in a positive light, and the more diligent he/she should be in the search for information that make the ingroup appear in a positive light. High identifiers are more invested in the ingroup, find it more painful to be exposed to negative information about the ingroup, and are thus more inclined to turn a blind eye toward information that reflects negatively on the ingroup. Stigma theory (Crocker & Major, 1989) and downward comparison theory (Wills, 1981) also propose that unfavorable comparisons are painful, and that people engage in a number of strategies to avoid them. Since negative information should be all the more painful the more people are identified, high identifiers should be more motivated to avoid being made aware of their group deprivation. As a result, there should be a negative effect of identification on perceived deprivation.

It is also plausible that there might be a *negative effect of deprivation on identification*: Several findings suggest that people identify more with powerful, high-status groups (Roccas, 2003; Sachdev & Bourhis, 1985, 1987). Hence, to the extent that a deprived group is usually neither powerful nor of high status, one might expect that identification with deprived groups would be lower.¹

Given the heterogeneous nature of evidence to date about the identification–deprivation relationship, it seems likely that the link must be moderated by one or more further, hitherto untheorized factors. SIT does not explicitly discuss moderators of the identification–deprivation relationship, and theorizing about this therefore constitutes a development of the existing theory, but at the same time some of the basic assumptions of SIT can be read as implying which factors might exhibit a moderating function. First, it is noteworthy that the accounts cited above as outlining a positive link between the two variables (e.g., SIT) all tacitly or explicitly assume a degree of intergroup conflict, which characteristically brings about perceived goal interdependence and concerns about fairness between groups. In contrast, the accounts delineating a negative link between the two variables (e.g., SIT again, also stigma theory) all share the notion that people are motivated by self-esteem management concerns. Trying to distil this to the most basic difference, one could argue that the two scenarios differ in whether people are primarily driven by *group status* concerns (wanting the best position for their group within the social strata) or *enhancement* concerns (wanting to protect their self-esteem and to view the self and the ingroup in a positive light).

Ingroup Attributions as a Moderator

In this research, we focus on a situation in which enhancement motives can be assumed to be at the fore, resulting in an inverse relationship between identification and deprivation. In such a situation, we propose that the extent to which the ingroup's relative deprivation is attributed internally to the ingroup – that is, how far the ingroup itself is seen as being responsible for being deprived – is relevant. Indeed, attributions for perceived disadvantages can have powerful psychological and behavioral consequences (Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002; Weiner, 1980).

If ingroup-directed attributions are strong, then identification should affect deprivation negatively: The more highly identified people are, the more they will be motivated to see the ingroup in a positive light, and the more they find negative information about the ingroup painful. Because high identifiers are motivated to play down anything negative about their ingroup, and because deprivation attributed internally reflects particularly badly on the ingroup,

¹ Not all researchers have focused on the direct link between identification and deprivation. Some have conceptualized identification as a moderator of the effects of deprivation on variables like collective action and intergroup attitudes (Kawakami & Dion, 1993; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1996; Smith et al., 1999). These processes need not be mutually exclusive, but they might be at play simultaneously.

identification negatively affects deprivation if this deprivation is attributed to the ingroup. If there is little ingroup attribution for the deprivation, however, acknowledging deprivation does not reflect as badly on the image of the ingroup, and there should be no effect of identification on deprivation.

Moreover, if ingroup attributions are made, then deprivation might also be expected to negatively impact identification. This is because deprivation particularly reflects negatively on the ingroup if the ingroup is seen to be at least partly responsible for it. Under this condition, people should be motivated to psychologically disengage from the negatively perceived group. If ingroup attributions are absent, however, high deprivation does not necessarily reflect as negatively on the ingroup. Under this condition, deprivation does not lead to the same motivation to disidentify, and one might expect a null effect of deprivation on identification.²

These two mechanisms of moderation of the inverse relationship between identification and deprivation by ingroup attributions were tested in a situation in which enhancement motives were thought to be relevant, namely, by studying British students and their perceived deprivation vis-à-vis German students. It is reasonable to assume that British students would not, for example, perceive a negative interdependence between levels of student debt in Britain and Germany, which would be expected to be linked to group status concerns. Despite this absence of intergroup conflict and goal interdependence, we expected German students to be a relevant comparison target that would be interesting and engaging for our participants, given the ongoing debate about tuition fees in Britain and the rather different politics regarding higher education in several continental European countries. This, then, was the intergroup context in which we tested whether ingroup attributions would moderate the association between identification and deprivation, such that the negative link would only emerge if ingroup attributions were present.

Method

Participants

A group of 189 psychology students from a British university participated in the study in exchange for course credits (mean age = 20, 155 females, 34 males).

Procedure and Measures

Participants were welcomed by a research assistant who conducted the study. All participants read a short article, allegedly published in a reputable newspaper, to set the scene and to manipulate ingroup attributions. There were two conditions (high ingroup attributions versus low ingroup attributions), and participants were randomly assigned to the two conditions ($N = 93$ in “ingroup attribution low,” and $N = 96$ in “ingroup attribution high”). The article was allegedly written by someone called “Roger Stamp” and cited a report published by the “Committee of Higher Education in Europe.” The report allegedly found that in both England and Germany the cost of housing and the size of student fees were identified as two main contributors to financial pressure on students, and that the financial situation of British students was worse than that of German students. It cited that the average debt upon graduation was higher in Britain than in Germany. The article then went on to manipulate ingroup attributions.

In the “ingroup attributions high” condition, this situation was reported to be due to the fact that British students spend more money on luxuries like evening entertainment, electronic gadgets, and other costly aspects of modern life. It reported that the disadvantaged financial situation of British students was therefore due to their own behavior. In the “ingroup attributions low” condition, the financial situation of British students was reported to *not* be due to the fact that British students spend more money on luxuries like evening entertainment, electronic gadgets, and other costly aspects of modern life. The disadvantaged financial situation of British students was therefore reported to not be due to their own behavior. The exact wording of the manipulation is given in the Appendix. After reading this fictitious information, participants filled out a questionnaire which contained the measures.

Identification was measured with an 11-item rating scale adapted from Brown and colleagues (1986, options ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 7 = *very much*). The items were “I see myself as a British student”; “It is important to me to be a British student”; “I do not have much in common with other a British students” (reversed); “I am glad to be a British student”; “Being a British student is important to my sense of self”; “I identify with other British students”; “I regret being a British student” (reversed); “I feel close links with other British students”; “I feel a certain degree of emotional attachment to British students”; “I am not proud to be a British student” (reversed); “I don’t feel a strong sense of commitment to the welfare of British students” (re-

² Many conceptualizations of deprivation include a “fairness” component, i.e., the attribution of the ingroup’s shortfall to some external, unfair factor. This component of deprivation is conceptually distinct from the proposed moderator, attributions to the ingroup. Whether or not something is attributed to factor “a” can often be empirically orthogonal to the question of whether the same thing is also attributed to factor “b.” Theoretically, ingroup deprivation can be attributed simultaneously externally (unfairness) and internally (ingroup’s contribution), only externally, only internally, or to neither type of factor. For example, if someone believes the inferior position of his/her ingroup is attributable to discrimination, this person might still believe that the inferior position is (or is not) also due to laziness: The level of external attribution and the level of internal attribution remain empirically distinct.

Table 1. Bivariate correlations and variable means

	Manipulation (coded 0, 1)	Ingroup attributions manipulation check	Deprivation	Means
Ingroup attributions manipulation check	.54 ***			4.28
Deprivation	.07	.07		3.68
Identification	-.02	-.15 *	-.09	5.07

Note. *** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$.

versed); $\alpha = .85$. Because identification can be conceptualized as being constituted by the simultaneous presence of different identification facets (such as cognitive and affective components, see Brown et al., 1986), we followed others who combine measures of these different components into one composite scale (Abrams et al., 1999; Petta & Walker, 1992).

Following others (e.g., Lepore & Brown, 1997), we measured identification after the experimental manipulation since measuring it beforehand could have sensitized the participants to the issues under study and thereby have led to the interaction of identification with the experimental manipulation in unknown ways. This risk of sensitization is highlighted in the classic work by Campbell and Stanley (1966). Moreover, identification is a highly stable construct that was not anticipated to be affected by the manipulation. Indeed, analyses confirmed that the experimental manipulation did not have any direct effect on identification (see Table 1), which further confirms our chosen order of measurement to be optimal.

Two items measured perceived *relative deprivation*. Participants were asked to think about the financial situation of British students overall. Items were “How do you think British students are doing financially?” (1 = *not at all well* to 7 = *very well*) and “How satisfied are you with the financial situation of British students?” (1 = *not at all satisfied* to 7 = *very satisfied*). Both items were subsequently reversed so that high values indicate greater perceived deprivation; $r = .71$, $p < .001$. This measure emulates other approaches that measure the cognitive and affective components of deprivation (Guimond & Dube-Simard, 1983) and that combine the different components into one composite scale (e.g., Tropp & Wright, 1999).

Two items functioned as a manipulation check for *attributions to the ingroup*: “Differences in the consumer spending of British and German students contribute to the financial situation of British students compared to German students”; and “The fact that British students spend so much money on lifestyle choices contributes to the financial situation of British students compared to German students” (1 = *not at all* to 7 = *very much*; $r = .79$, $p < .001$). The questionnaire also contained some demographic questions and some additional items not of relevance in the present context. Upon completion of the study, participants were thanked and debriefed.

Results

Manipulation Check

An ANOVA was conducted with the experimental factor with two levels as independent variable and ingroup attributions as the dependent variable. This yielded a highly significant effect, $F(1, 187) = 77.31$, $p < .001$. As expected, ingroup attributions were higher in the “ingroup attribution high” condition, $M_s = 5.51$ vs. 3.37. Bivariate correlations and variable means are provided in Table 1. Predictors in the following regression analyses were centered around the mean. Stepwise linear multiple regression analyses were conducted to test the hypotheses. The main effects were always entered in step 1, and the interaction between the predictors was always entered in a subsequent step in the analysis.

Moderation of the Effect of Identification on Deprivation

To examine whether the effect of identification on perceived relative deprivation was moderated by experimentally manipulated ingroup attributions, we regressed deprivation on identification, experimental condition (coded 0 vs. 1), and their interaction. This yielded a nonsignificant R^2 at the first step; $R^2 = .01$, $F(2, 184) = 1.21$, *ns*, but a significant R^2 change at the second step: $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F(3, 183) = 3.97$, $p < .05$. The beta for identification was $\beta = -.08$, *ns*, the beta for condition was $\beta = .07$, *ns*, but the beta for the interaction term was $\beta = -.19$, $p < .05$. To interpret the interaction, we compared the relationship between identification and deprivation between experimental conditions. For those in the low ingroup attribution condition, the effect was not significant when predicting deprivation from identification, $\beta = .04$, *ns*. In the high ingroup attribution condition, the effect was significant, $\beta = -.23$, $p < .05$. Hence, as expected, identification was associated only with less reported deprivation if it was attributed to the ingroup.

Moderation of the Effect of Deprivation on Identification

To examine whether the effect of perceived relative deprivation on identification was moderated by condition, we regressed identification on deprivation, condition, and their interaction. This yielded a nonsignificant R^2 at the first step; $R^2 = .008$, $F(2, 184) = 0.73$, *ns*, and a marginally significant R^2 change at the second step: $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F(3, 183) = 3.26$, $p < .08$. The beta for deprivation was $\beta = -.08$, *ns*, the beta for condition was $\beta = -.02$, *ns*, and the beta for the interaction term was $\beta = -.19$, $p < .08$. Of necessity, the relationship between identification and deprivation in the two con-

ditions were unchanged from those reported above (.04 and -.23 respectively).

In sum, there was some indication that the effect of deprivation on identification was moderated by ingroup attributions, such that high perceived deprivation only led people to disidentify from the group if they attributed the deprivation to the ingroup, i.e., if they thought the ingroup was to blame for it. However, this evidence was not as strong as for the other causal direction, that is, for the effect of identification on deprivation being moderated by ingroup attributions.³

Discussion

The contradictory evidence for the relationship between identification and deprivation suggests that moderators might be important for determining the conditions under which the mutual relationships between the two variables are positive or negative. It seems that positive effects can be expected mainly in settings where intergroup conflict and concerns about group status are salient. In contrast, negative effects can be expected mainly when enhancement motives are prominent. The present study tested a situation where enhancement motives can be assumed to prevail, and it tested whether the identification–deprivation link is moderated by ingroup attributions in this condition. As expected, stronger identification was only associated with less reported deprivation (and – to a lesser extent – vice versa) if ingroup attributions were high. When ingroup attributions were low, the effects of identification and deprivation on each other became nonsignificant.

It is obvious that empirically we only addressed part of our theory, and it is worth fleshing out somewhat more the anticipated relationships for the other part of the theory, i.e., where the identification–deprivation link is thought to be positive, as well as discussing how our theory maps onto the previous research findings.

As foreshadowed in the Introduction, we propose that, in situations in which intergroup conflict and goal interdependence are salient, concerns about the status of the ingroup will be more pressing than enhancement concerns, potentially rendering the identification–deprivation link

positive. As indicated above, those who identify more strongly might desire more for their ingroup which might lead to increased perceptions of deprivation (Tropp & Wright, 1999), and deprivation might increase identification just like the existence of an external threat can lead to people rallying around the flag (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Again, however, whether the mutual positive effects emerge may depend on a range of potential moderators, some of which have already been previously emphasized. Of note, the perceived permeability of group boundaries and the perceived stability of the social strata have been highlighted by SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

According to this account, the inclination of disadvantaged group members to rebel against their status depends on the perceived permeability of group boundaries because group members are only thought to rebel if individual mobility strategies do not present a feasible option (Wright & Taylor, 1998). Consequently, one could propose that deprivation *only increases* identification if perceived permeability is low, because if it is high people can be expected to prefer individual mobility strategies and hence to disengage from the ingroup. Further, the stability of the social strata is thought to be important because only if conditions are relatively unstable do cognitive alternatives – i.e., the notion that things might be changed – become available. Relatedly, the importance of a belief that change can be brought about has also been highlighted by work on collective action, which proposes that action is not taken if resources and opportunities to bring about change are seen to be lacking and if action therefore does not seem efficacious (Klandermans, 2001). Based on this, one might propose that identification *only increases* deprivation if perceived stability is low, or if social change appears possible. Under these conditions, deprivation might be emphasized by group members in order to underline the need for change and to propel others into action. In contrast, if social change does not appear possible, there is no benefit for high identifiers to emphasize deprivation, and they should be expected to refrain from doing so.

Of course, SIT has inspired a large amount of research. Therefore, more previous research has focused on the effects of the structural variables of SIT and the potential moderators of a positive mutual effect of identification on deprivation and vice versa (e.g., Boen & Vanbeselaere, 2000; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1997; Kessler & Mum-

³ Two additional analyses were performed to assess the role of perceived similarity between the self and other ingroup members. First, a median split was performed on the third identification item (“I do/don’t have much in common with other ingroup members”). This variable was then used as an additional factor in an ANOVA with the manipulation as IV and the manipulation check as DV. No interaction was observed between the two factors ($F = 0.002$, *ns*), indicating that perceived similarity did not moderate the effectiveness of the manipulation. Second, the main analyses were repeated with an identification measure which did not include the two identification items which suggest similarity (item 3 “I don’t have much in common with” and item 8 “I feel close links with,” $\alpha = .84$ for the reduced scale). The pattern of results obtained with this reduced identification scale was the same as that reported in the paper, which further suggests that similarity did not impact the results. Additional analyses were also performed to test whether the affective and cognitive identification items would show different effects. First, a factor analysis confirmed that affective and cognitive identification items did not load on two separate factors. Correspondingly, building two separate scales for the cognitive and affective items resulted in a worse alpha than that of the whole scale. In four further regressions to re-run the two regression analyses reported above with the two separate scales, the interactions did not reach significance. This is not surprising, given that both the theoretical conceptualization of identification and the psychometric properties of the scale suggest that the two components should not be analyzed separately.

mendey, 2002). This is partially why in our present effort we sought to highlight the moderation of a negative effect, by focusing on a situation commensurate with enhancement concerns. However, clearly a systematic and comprehensive test of our theoretical approach is still outstanding, and this will be an important issue for future research.

How, then, does our theoretical model map onto previous research? Unfortunately, many of the previous studies did not measure or report the moderators we highlighted. However, our account would suggest that Tropp and Wright's (1999) ethnic minority participants in the United States as well as Mummendey et al.'s (1999) and Kessler and Mummendey's (2002) East Germans, and Abrams' (1990) Scots in the UK context, all would have been more concerned about their objective group status than about self-enhancement. Moreover, we would suggest that for the positive effects to emerge in these settings rather than to be zero, perceived permeability was probably low, and stability would have been high.

In contrast, Abrams et al.'s (1999) Hong Kong residents as well as our various ethnic minority samples in Germany and the UK (Zagefka, 2004; Zagefka & Brown, 2005) would have been more concerned about enhancement, and ingroup attributions would have been quite high in these settings. If we take our own data as an example, this pattern seems plausible: Our participants were reasonably young (mainly teenagers), and one might imagine that they might have been more motivated by hedonistic concerns (enhancement) than group status and fairness. Also, it is plausible to assume that they would have attributed deprivation to the ingroup, given how widespread hierarchy justification ideologies appear to be (e.g., Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004; Wright & Taylor, 1998).

It is considerably more difficult to speculate about the dynamics of the settings that yielded zero correlations, given that they are proposed to emerge under a number of different conditions. For example, it is possible that Tougas and Veilleux's (1988) women were concerned with their group status, but that the stability of the social strata (as highlighted by SIT) was so high that no positive effects emerged. Equally, it is possible that these women were concerned with enhancement, but that ingroup attributions were so low that no negative effects emerged. Because of these different possibilities, and the fact that our proposed moderators have not been tested in one parsimonious effort, further research is urgently needed.

In terms of broader theoretical implications of our work, we believe of the most important suggestions to come out of our model is that future work, both in the SIT and the RDT tradition, would be well advised to attempt to either measure or manipulate people's prevalent motives. We suggest that different intergroup situations, e.g., whether intergroup conflict is salient or not, will lead to very different prevalent motives. Specifically, the question of whether people are primarily motivated by advancing the objective position of their ingroup or by feeling good about themselves will have important effects on their identity dynam-

ics and potentially their behavior. Prevalent motives are an aspect which to date is still very underresearched in intergroup relations, and this will hopefully be rectified in future research efforts.

The empirical aspect of this paper has some notable strengths and weaknesses. One obvious limitation is that we focused only on a student category. Although we have no theoretical reason to believe that the mechanisms demonstrated here would not be applicable to other social groups (e.g., ethnic or national categories), further studies would have to be conducted to establish this point. Another limitation is that our design cannot account for the causal direction of the link between identification and deprivation. Although we assumed, based on the findings of others, that there is some element of bicausality to this relationship (e.g., Tougas & Beaton, 2002), it is nonetheless possible that the causal effect is stronger in one direction than the other (de la Sablonnière & Tougas, 2008). More research would need to be conducted to achieve greater certainty in this regard.

Nevertheless, an important contribution of this paper is that it presents an inaugural exploration of moderators of the identification–deprivation relationship. While some theoretical accounts of this relationship have been offered by deprivation researchers (e.g., Petta & Walker, 1992; Tougas & Beaton, 2002; Walker, 1999), none of them focused on moderating effects. In doing this, this paper not only advances current theorizing, but also presents an account of how the hitherto inconsistent empirical findings about the relationship between the two variables can be reconciled.

One issue worthy of further exploration is the relationship between perceived discrimination and identification, which in some ways mirrors what has been discussed for the deprivation–identification link. Perceived discrimination is related to perceived relative deprivation but it is somewhat broader: Deprivation can be described as one type of discrimination, namely, economic discrimination. However, other types of discrimination exist. Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey (1999) as well as Schmitt, Branscombe, and Postmes (2003) found positive relationships between discrimination and identification (see also Sellers & Shelton, 2003). However, others have found the two concepts to be unrelated (Lee, 2003; Verkuyten, 2002). Yet some other findings (e.g., Verkuyten, 2003) would suggest that perceived discrimination and identification are negatively related: Levin, Sidanius, Rabinowitz, and Federico (1998) found that identification and legitimizing ideologies are negatively related for minority members. Major and colleagues (2002) found that identification and perceived ease of individual mobility was negatively related for minority members. Many factors might explain these divergent findings, but one explanation could be that the discrimination–identification relationship is also moderated by the extent to which discrimination is not only attributed to external unfairness but also to internal, ingroup factors. While it is beyond the scope of the present work to test this, this might be an interesting investigation for the future.

An important practical implication of these findings is that attributions to the ingroup should be considered by people trying to instigate collective action. It has been shown that both perceived deprivation and ingroup identification need to be present in order for action participation to occur (Simon et al., 1998). However, these two conditions appear to be directly and negatively linked whenever a low ingroup status is attributed to the ingroup. Those interested in fostering movement participation might therefore benefit from directly communicating to group members that internal attributions are not indicated, in order to improve engagement with the collective cause.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by an ESRC grant to the third author (RES-000-23-0041) and a grant by the Solomon Asch Center for the Study of Ethnopolitical Conflict to the first and last authors.

References

- Abrams, D. (1990). *Political identity: Relative deprivation, social identity, and the case of Scottish nationalism*. London: Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) 16–19, Initiative Occasional Papers.
- Abrams, D., Hinkle, S., & Tomlins, M. (1999). Leaving Hong Kong?: The roles of attitude, subjective norm, perceived control, social identity and relative deprivation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23, 319–338.
- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 80–114.
- Boen, F., & Vanbeselaere, N. (2000). Responding to membership of a low-status group: The effects of stability, permeability and individual ability. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 3, 41–62.
- Bornman, E., & Appelgryn, A. E. M. (1999). Predictors of ethnic identification in a transitional South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 29, 62–71.
- Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 135–149.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745–778.
- Brown, R., Condor, S., Matthews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. A. (1986). Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 59, 273–286.
- Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (2006). Choice of comparisons in intergroup settings: The role of temporal information and comparison motives. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 649–671.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). *Experimental and quasiexperimental designs for research*. London: Houghton Mifflin.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, 96, 608–630.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 504–553). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Crosby, F. (1976). A model of egoistical relative deprivation. *Psychological Review*, 83, 85–113.
- Crosby, F. (1982). *Relative deprivation and working women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de la Sablonnière, R., & Tougas, F. (2008). Relative deprivation and social identity in times of dramatic social change: The case of nurses. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 2293–2314.
- Dion, K. L. (1979). Intergroup conflict and intragroup cohesiveness. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 221–244). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Doise, W. (1988). Individual and social identities in intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 99–111.
- Duckitt, J., & Mphuthing, T. (2002). Relative deprivation and intergroup attitudes. In I. Walker & H. Smith (Eds.), *Relative deprivation. Specification, development, and integration* (pp. 69–90). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellemers, N., & Bos, A. E. R. (1987). Social identity, relative deprivation, and coping with the threat of position loss: A field study among native shopkeepers in Amsterdam. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1987–2006.
- Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P., & Ouwerkerk, J. K. (1999). Self-categorization, commitment to the group and group self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 371–389.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1997). Sticking together or falling apart: In-group identification as a psychological determinant of group commitment versus individual mobility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 617–626.
- Folger, R. (1986). A referent cognitions theory of relative deprivation. In J. M. Olson, C. P. Herman, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Relative deprivation and social comparison: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 4, pp. 33–55). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guimond, S., & Dube-Simard, L. (1983). Relative deprivation theory and the Quebec nationalist movement: The cognition-emotion distinction and the personal-group deprivation issue. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 527–535.
- Gurin, P., & Townsend, A. (1986). Properties of gender identity and their implications for gender consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 139–148.
- Gurr, T. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jackson, J. W., & Smith, E. (1999). Conceptualising social identity: A new framework and evidence for the impact of different dimensions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 120–135.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1997). Strength of identification and intergroup differentiation: The influence of group norms. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 603–609.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25, 881–919.

- Kawakami, K., & Dion, K. L. (1993). The impact of salient self-identities on relative deprivation and action intentions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 525–540.
- Kawakami, K., & Dion, K. L. (1995). Social identity and affect as determinants of collective action: Toward an integration of relative deprivation and social identity theories. *Theory and Psychology*, 5, 551–577.
- Kelly, C., & Breinlinger, S. (1996). *The social psychology of collective action: Identity, injustice and gender*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Kessler, T., & Mummendey, A. (2002). Sequential or parallel processes? A longitudinal field study concerning determinants of identity management strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 75–88.
- Klandermans, B. (2001). Why social movements come into being and why people join them. In J. Blau (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to sociology* (pp. 268–281). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lalonde, R. N., & Cameron, J. E. (1993). An intergroup perspective on immigrant acculturation with a focus on collective strategies. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28, 57–74.
- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., . . . Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 144–165.
- Lee, R. M. (2003). Do ethnic identity and other-group orientation protect against discrimination for Asian Americans? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 133–141.
- Lepore, L., & Brown, R. (1997). Category and stereotype activation: Is prejudice inevitable? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 275–285.
- Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Federico, C. (1998). Ethnic identity, legitimizing ideologies, and social status: A matter of ideological asymmetry. *Political Psychology*, 19, 373–404.
- Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 26, 293–353.
- Major, B., Gramzow, R. H., McCoy, S., Levin, S., Schmader, T., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Perceiving personal discrimination: The role of group status and legitimizing ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 269–282.
- Mummendey, A., Kessler, T., Klink, A., & Mielke, R. (1999). Strategies to cope with negative social identity: Predictions by social identity theory and relative deprivation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 229–245.
- Olson, J. M., Herman, C. P., & Zanna, M. P. (Eds.). (1986). *Relative deprivation and social comparison: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 4). London: Erlbaum.
- Olson, J. M., Roesse, N. J., Meen, J., & Robertson, D. J. (1995). The preconditions and consequences of relative deprivation: Two field studies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 944–964.
- Osborne, D., Smith, H. J., & Huo, Y. J. (2012). More than a feeling: Discrete emotions mediate the relationship between relative deprivation and reactions to workplace furloughs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 628–641.
- Petta, G., & Walker, I. (1992). Relative deprivation and ethnic identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 285–293.
- Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation*. London: Sage.
- Roccas, S. (2003). Identification and status revisited: The moderating role of self-enhancement and self-transcendence values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 726–736.
- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S., Halevy, N., & Eidelson, R. (2008). Toward a unifying model of identification with groups: Integrating theoretical perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 280–306.
- Runciman, W. G. (1966). *Relative deprivation and social justice. A study of attitudes to social inequality in twentieth century England*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. (1985). Social categorization and power differentials in group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 415–432.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. (1987). Status differentials and intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 17, 277–293.
- Schmitt, M., & Maes, J. (2002). Stereotypic ingroup bias as self-defense against relative deprivation: Evidence from a longitudinal study of the German unification process. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 309–326.
- Schmitt, M., Maes, J., & Widaman, K. (2010). Longitudinal effects of egoistic and fraternal relative deprivation on well-being and protest. *International Journal of Psychology*, 45, 122–130.
- Schmitt, M. T., & Branscombe, N. R. (2002). The meaning and consequences of perceived discrimination in disadvantaged and privileged social groups. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 167–199). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Schmitt, M. T., Branscombe, N. R., & Postmes, T. (2003). Women's emotional responses to the pervasiveness of gender discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 297–312.
- Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1079–1092.
- Simon, B. (2004). Identity, mobilization and participation. In B. Simon (Ed.), *Identity in modern society: A social psychological perspective* (pp. 156–180). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicised collective identity. A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, 56, 319–331.
- Simon, B., Loewy, M., Stuermer, S., Weber, U., Freytag, P., Habig, C., . . . Spahlinger, P. (1998). Collective identification and social movement participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 646–658.
- Smith, H. J., Pettigrew, T. F., Pippin, G. M., & Bialosiewicz, S. (2012). Relative deprivation: A theoretical and meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16, 203–232.
- Smith, H. J., Spears, R., & Hamstra, I. (1999). Social identity and the context of relative deprivation. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity* (pp. 205–229). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall.
- Tougas, F., & Beaton, A. M. (2002). Personal and group relative deprivation: Connecting the “I” to the “we.” In I. Walker & H. Smith (Eds.), *Relative deprivation. Specification, development, integration* (pp. 119–135). Cambridge, UK: University Press.
- Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1988). The influence of identification, collective relative deprivation, and procedure of implementation on women's response to affirmative action: A causal model.

- eling approach. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 20, 15–28.
- Trew, K., & Benson, D. E. (1996). Dimensions of social identity in Northern Ireland. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities: Social psychological analyses of social change* (pp. 123–143). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (1999). Ingroup identification and relative deprivation: An examination across multiple social comparisons. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 707–724.
- Vanneman, R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1972). Race and relative deprivation in the urban United States. *Race*, 13, 461–486.
- Veilleux, F., Tougas, F., & Rinfret, N. (1992). Des citoyens en colère: Une question de privation et/ou d'identité sociale? [Angry citizens: A question of deprivation and/or social identity?]. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, 24, 59–70.
- Verkuyten, M. (2002). Perceptions of ethnic discrimination by minority and majority early adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Psychology*, 37, 321–332.
- Verkuyten, M. (2003). Positive and negative self-esteem among ethnic minority early adolescents: Social and cultural sources and threats. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32, 267–277.
- Walker, I. (1999). Effects of personal and group relative deprivation on personal and collective self-esteem. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 2, 365–380.
- Walker, I., & Smith, H. J. (Eds.). (2002). *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wann, D. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1995). Influence of level of identification with a group and physiological arousal on perceived intergroup complexity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 223–235.
- Weiner, B. (1980). *Human motivation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Wills, T. A. (1981). Downward comparison principles in social psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90, 245–271.
- Wright, S. C., & Taylor, D. M. (1998). Responding to tokenism: Individual action in the face of collective injustice. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 647–667.
- Zagefka, H. (2004). *Comparisons and deprivation in ethnic minority settings*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Kent, Canterbury.
- Zagefka, H., & Brown, R. (2005). Comparisons and perceived deprivation in ethnic minority settings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 467–482.

Received June 2, 2010

Final revision received May 31, 2012

Accepted December 12, 2012

Published online February 27, 2013

Hanna Zagefka

Royal Holloway
University of London
London TW20 0EX
UK
Tel. +44 7891401294
E-mail hanna.zagefka@rhul.ac.uk

Appendix

The Comparative Wording of the “Ingroup Attribution Low” Versus “Ingroup Attribution High” Conditions

... “Another prime factor considered in the report is the specific pattern of student consumer behavior. Here, the conclusion is clear: Student consumer spending is (pretty much in line/way out of line) with other EU countries and (cannot really/can) account for the comparatively bad financial situation of British students. British students are

holding increasingly materialistic attitudes. (But compared to/compared to) German students the British are (no bigger spenders/particularly keen) on evening entertainment, electronic gadgets, and other costly aspects of modern life. So, the disadvantaged situation of British students (does not seem to /seems to) be due to their own behavior.”